



FACSIMILE

DATE: August 03, 2004
OFFICIAL PAPER

Please deliver this and the following pages to:

Examiner: **Fred Ehichioya**
U.S.P.T.O. Group Art Unit: **2172**
Telecopier No.: **(703) 746-9349**
U.S. Senal No.: **09/783,820**
Client/Matter No.: **MSFT-0232**
Sender's Name: **Peter M. Ullman**
Pages to Follow: **1**

If transmission is not complete, please call our Philadelphia Office at (215) 568-3100.

COVER MESSAGE:

OFFICIAL FACSIMILE. PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER IMMEDIATELY.

Attached hereto is/are the following documents:

- 1) Proposed agenda for interview

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE THANK YOU

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations

PHILADELPHIA
One Liberty Place, 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-568-3100
Fax: 215-568-3439

SEATTLE
999 Third Avenue, Suite 1606
Seattle, WA 98104
206-332-1380
Fax: 206-624-7317

JOB CODE: 02583

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 03 2004

OFFICIAL

Proposed agenda for interview in 09/783,820

1. The Office Action does not appear to discuss any grounds for rejecting claim 27.
2. In the March 24, 2004 amendment, applicant presented arguments on the following features. The May 16, 2004 Office Action does not appear to respond to these arguments. Applicant requests an interview to discuss why these features differ from the applied prior art:
 - a. The queue-per-media feature (claims 1, 21, 26, and 27)
 - b. The monotonically increasing sequences feature (claim 2)
 - c. The concurrent retrieval feature (claim 3)
 - d. The timestamp feature (claim 7).

Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments raised in the March 24, 2004 amendment, which arguments have not been addressed in the most recent office action. Additionally, while the claim numbers above refer to the claim numbers as to which these features were argued in the 3/24/04 office action, it should also be noted that a feature similar to (a) appears in claim 12; that a feature similar to (b) appears in claims 16, 17, 18, and 24; a feature similar to (c) appears in claim 11; and a feature similar to (d) appears in claim 23.